



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/612,142	07/07/2000	Ronald Glen Feigen	IRI05275	7805

22863 7590 02/23/2004

MOTOROLA, INC.  
CORPORATE LAW DEPARTMENT - #56-238  
3102 NORTH 56TH STREET  
PHOENIX, AZ 85018

EXAMINER

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

dm.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/612,142

**Applicant(s)**

FEIGEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Andrew L Nalven

**Art Unit**

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-18 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reeds III et al US Patent No 5,153,919 (hereafter designated "Reeds"). Reeds teaches a service provision authentication system for mobile phones.
4. With regards to claims 1, 8-9, and 16-17, Reeds teaches the generating of a random value (Reeds, column 4 lines 52-53), the determining of memory range information identifying a range of memory space within the remote unit having data to be hashed by the hashing function (Reeds, column 4 lines 52-58, column 6 lines 4-9), determining position information indicative of a position within a data stream to be generated within the remote unit at which the random value is to be located (Reeds, column 4 lines 52-58, Figure 2), and delivering the random value, memory range information, and position information to the remote unit for use by the remote unit in performing a hashing operation (Reeds, column 6 lines 4-11).

Art Unit: 2134

5. With regards to claims 2, 12, and 15, Reeds further teaches the receiving of a hash value from the remote unit in which the hash value is a result of the hashing operation performed within the remote unit based upon the random value, memory range information, and position information delivered to the remote unit (Reeds, column 9 line 59 – column 10 line 1).
6. With regards to claims 3 and 13, Reeds teaches the comparing of the hash value received from the remote unit to a hash value generated outside the remote unit (Reeds, column 6 lines 25-34, column 10 lines 3-5).
7. With regards to claim 4, Reeds teaches the hash value being generated outside the remote unit within a communication unit that is a replica of the remote unit by showing identical storage of data (Reeds, column 4 lines 30-49 and column 6 lines 25-27).
8. With regards to claim 5, Reeds teaches the hash value generated outside the remote unit is a result of a hashing operation based upon the random value, memory range information, and position information (Reeds, column 6 lines 25-34, column 10 lines 3-5).
9. With regards to claim 6, Reeds teaches the steps of generating, determining memory range information, and position information is performed in a location different from the remote unit (Reeds, column 4 lines 50-58).
10. With regards to claim 7, Reeds teaches a computer readable medium having program instructions stored thereon for use in implementing the method steps (Reeds, column 11 line 25 - column 12 line 16).

Art Unit: 2134

11. With regards to claim 10, Reeds teaches the transmitter transmitting the interrogation message to the remote unit via a communications network (Reeds, Figure 1).

12. With regards to claim 11, Reeds teaches a local memory storing information representative of the information that should be stored in the remote unit (Reeds, column 6 lines 25-27), a hash unit for performing a hashing operation on information stored within the local memory to generated a control value (Reeds, column 6 lines 25-34, Figure 2), and the hashing operation being performed using the random value, memory range information, and position information (Reeds, column 4 lines 30-49 and column 6 lines 25-27).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeds III et al US Patent No 5,153,919 in view of Leighton et al US Patent No 5,432,852. Reeds, as described above, fails to teach a selection unit for selecting a hashing algorithm from a plurality of hashing algorithms. Leighton teaches selecting a hashing algorithm from a plurality of hashing algorithms for use by the remote unit and means for indicating the selected hashing algorithm to the remote unit (Leighton,

Art Unit: 2134

column 14 lines 60-63). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Leighton's method of picking from a plurality of hashing algorithms because it makes it harder for an attacker to crack the hashing algorithm (Leighton, column 14 line 63 – column 15 line 7).

### ***Conclusion***

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

16. Trostle et al US Patent No 5,919,257 teaches a network workstation intrusion detection system that uses hashes to detect intrusions.

17. Lovelace et al US Patent No 6,263,431 teaches an operating system bootstrap security mechanism.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L Nalven whose telephone number is 703 305 8407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703 308 4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

\*\*\*

Andrew Nalven

ALN

*Matthew D. Smithers*  
MATTHEW SMITHERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*Art Unit 2137*